

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

JOHN ANTHONY GENTRY

v.

THE TENNESSEE BOARD OF
JUDICIAL CONDUCT, et al.

)
)
)
)
)
)

NO. 3:17-0020

ORDER

Plaintiff's motion (Docket Entry No. 9) for clarification of the Order entered January 27, 2017 (Docket Entry No. 7) is DENIED in all respects other than the following. Pursuant to the discretion afforded to the Court under Rule 26(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court has exempted the parties in this action from the initial disclosures required by Rule 26(a), and pursuant to Local Rule 16.01(b)(2)(b), this case is exempt from customized case management because one of the parties appears *pro se*. The directive to the Clerk to send copies of all orders entered in this case to the *pro se* Plaintiff and to any other *pro se* party by regular, first class mail (only), unless otherwise directed by the Court, does nothing other than relieve the Clerk of the expense of sending copies of Court mail by certified mail. Nothing in the Order prevents the Clerk from providing copies to Plaintiff directly if he requests copies of filings in this case in person from the intake counter at the Clerk's office and pays the appropriate copying fee as required. Plaintiff's assertion of possible equal protection violations is baseless.

Any party desiring to object to this Order may do so by filing a motion for review no later than fourteen (14) days from the date this Order is served upon the party. The motion for review must be accompanied by a brief or other pertinent documents to apprise the District Judge of the basis for the objection. *See* Rule 72.02(b) of the Local Rules of Court.

It is SO ORDERED.


BARBARA D. HOLMES
United States Magistrate Judge